

(Translation)

Minutes of the 3rd Meeting of Sham Shui Po District Council (6th Term)
under the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region

Date: 28 April 2020 (Tuesday)

Time: 9:30 a.m.

Venue: Conference Room, Sham Shui Po District Council

Present

Chairman

Mr YEUNG Yuk

Members

Ms CHAU Yuen-man, Eunice

Ms CHOW Wing-heng, Zoé

(Arrived at 9:50 a.m.)

Mr CHUM Tak-shing

(Arrived at 10:25 p.m.)

Mr HO Kai-ming, Calvin

Mr HO Kwan-chau, Leo

(Left at 1:45 p.m.)

Mr KONG Kwai-sang

Mr LAO Ka-hang, Andy

Ms LAU Pui-yuk, MH

(Left at 1:45 p.m.)

Mr LAU Wai-chung, Lawrence

Mr LEE Hon-ting, Howard

Mr LEE Man-ho, Leos

Mr LI Chun-hei, Joshua

Mr LI Kwing, Richard

Mr LI Ting-fung, Jay

Mr MAK Wai-ming

(Arrived at 9:35 a.m.)

Ms NG Mei, Carman

(Arrived at 9:35 a.m.)

Ms NG Yuet-lan, Janet

(Arrived at 9:43 a.m.)

Mr SIN Kam-ho, Jeffrey

Mr TAM Kwok-kiu, MH, JP

Mr TSUI Yat-hin, Ronald

(Arrived at 9:35 a.m.)

Mr WAI Woon-nam

Mr WONG Kit-long

Mr YAN Kai-wing

(Arrived at 11:50 a.m. and left at 1:45 p.m.)

Mr YUEN Hoi-man, Ramon

In Attendance

Mr LEE Kwok-hung, Damian, JP

Mr LEE Wai-yin, Brett

Mr LAM Wui-tsun, Brian

Miss CHIN Wai-sheung, Doris

Miss LAU Sze-nga, Vivicia

Ms CHAN Siu-ping, Daphne

Mr TAM Kin-fai, Simon

Ms LAU Kwok-mei, Mary

Ms LAM Shuk-wah, Amy

Mr LEE Wai-man, Raymond

Ms CHAU Fung-mui, Wendy

Mr HO Kai-hin, Tony

Mr CHAN Chi-suen, Rex

Mr LUK Chi-kwong

Ms LEE Shuk-ling, Agnes

Mr SUM Siu-hin

Mr AU Ka-lok

Mr LIM Ying-lam

Ms LING Kuk-yi

Mr TSE Kong-wai, Eric

District Officer (Sham Shui Po)

Assistant District Officer (Sham Shui Po) 1

Assistant District Officer (Sham Shui Po) 2

Senior Liaison Officer 1, Sham Shui Po District Office

Senior Liaison Officer 2, Sham Shui Po District Office

Senior Liaison Officer 3, Sham Shui Po District Office

Senior Liaison Officer 4, Sham Shui Po District Office

Regional Officer/Kowloon West, Community Relations Department, Independent Commission Against Corruption

Senior Community Relations Officer (Kowloon West), Community Relations Department, Independent Commission Against Corruption

Chief Engineer/S1, South Development Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department

District Social Welfare Officer (Sham Shui Po), Social Welfare Department

District Commander (Sham Shui Po District), Hong Kong Police Force

Police Community Relations Officer (Sham Shui Po District), Hong Kong Police Force

Chief Leisure Manager (HKE), Leisure and Cultural Services Department

District Leisure Manager (Sham Shui Po), Leisure and Cultural Services Department

District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Sham Shui Po), Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Chief Health Inspector (Sham Shui Po)1, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Chief Health Inspector 3 (Sham Shui Po), Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Chief Manager/M(KWS), Housing Department

Chief Transport Officer/Kowloon, Transport Department

Secretary

Ms HO Kam-ping, Jennifer

Senior Executive Officer (District Council), Sham Shui Po District Office

Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed Members and representatives from government departments to the third meeting of the Sham Shui Po District Council (“SSPDC”). To reduce the risk of the spread of the epidemic, the attendees had already checked their temperatures and registered their names before entering the Conference Room. Moreover, the public gallery would not be open and the duration of meeting would be limited to four hours.

Item 1: Confirmation of minutes of the 1st meeting held on 7 January 2020, the 1st Special Meeting held on 5 February 2020 and the 2nd meeting held on 11 February 2020

2. The three sets of minutes of the above meetings were confirmed without amendment.

Item 2: Matters for discussion

(a) 2020/2021 Work Plan of ICAC Regional Office (Kowloon West) (SSPDC Paper 38/20)

3. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of the Independent Commission Against Corruption (“ICAC”) to the meeting.

4. Ms Mary LAU introduced Paper 38/20 with the aid of PowerPoint.

5. Mr Joshua LI said that members of the public were of the view that ICAC only handled corruption cases involving pecuniary interest. They did not know that ICAC also investigated cases of misconduct in public office. He suggested strengthening the publicity work in the district.

6. Ms LAU Pui-yuk raised the following views: (i) the situation of bid-rigging in relation to building maintenance works was quite common. However, there were no cases being prosecuted successfully, making it hard to achieve a deterrent effect; (ii) she enquired whether ICAC had any targeted measures to combat bid-rigging.

7. Ms Mary LAU responded as follows: (i) misconduct in public office was a common law offence. The Court of Final Appeal had listed the following elements of what constituted an offence of misconduct in public office when hearing similar cases in the past:

(a) the subject person was a public official;

- (b) in the course of or in relation to his public office;
- (c) wilfully misconducted himself by act or omission (for example, by wilfully neglecting or failing to perform his duty);
- (d) without reasonable excuse or justification; and
- (e) where such misconduct was serious, not trivial, having regard to the responsibilities of the office and the officeholder, the importance of the public objects which they served and the nature and extent of the departure from those responsibilities.

(ii) the statutory duties of ICAC were to investigate suspected corruption cases and crimes related to corruption, including the offence of “misconduct in public office” under the common law. Whether the act contravened the law would depend on the case. If ICAC received relevant complaints, it would follow up on the case in a serious manner according to established procedures, provided that there was enough information; (iii) the Regional Offices of ICAC would contact the Owners’ Corporations (“OCs”) and local organisations from time to time to organise publicity and educational activities for promoting integrity building management and maintenance. She hoped that Members would assist in encouraging building management organisations to receive corruption prevention education service, in order to nip it in the bud; (iv) the Competition Commission was responsible for handling bid-rigging cases. If members of the public found any bid-rigging cases involving corruption, they could report the cases to ICAC.

8. Ms Janet NG raised the following enquiries: (i) when residents had doubts about the OC’s account, ICAC would ask residents to collect evidence by themselves first; (ii) after receiving a report from members of the public, she enquired whether ICAC would investigate the account and send a written request to ask the OC to clarify the irregular transactions in the account; (iii) she hoped that ICAC and the Competition Commission could work together to disseminate the combating bid-rigging messages to the public.

9. Ms Mary LAU responded as follows: (i) the Operations Department under ICAC had an established group dedicated to the investigation of corruption cases in building management, and would adopt a “double barrel” strategy in its investigation. On the one hand, ICAC would investigate pursuable complaints and charges would be laid if there was sufficient evidence. On the other hand, it would take timely intervention action according to the actual situation of the case. Apart from gathering evidence, it would also frustrate possible corrupt bid-rigging activities at an early stage and alert flat owners of the potential risks of corruption in the granting of works contracts, so that flat owners could consider taking suitable preventive measures when necessary; (ii) if OCs’

accounts were just messy or lacked transparency, and had nothing to do with corruption, residents could ask OCs to clarify the problems or seek help from professionals such as accountants; (iii) as it was not easy to discover corruption in building maintenance works, it was very important for the public to make a report; (iv) when making a report to ICAC, members of the public only needed to provide justification for the suspected corruption case. They did not need to collect evidence so long as they were not making a malicious report; (v) ICAC and the Competition Commission had made arrangements for referral of complaints to each other, and would participate in activities such as seminars to disseminate relevant messages to the public.

10. The Chairman concluded as follows: (i) he praised ICAC for working closely with DC Members in the past; (ii) he hoped that ICAC could let the public know what constituted misconduct in public office and bid-rigging by stepping up the publicity; (iii) he agreed that SSPDC would be the supporting organisation for ICAC's activities this year.

(b) Proposed allocation of Sham Shui Po District Council Funds in 2020-2021 financial year (SSPDC Paper 39/20)

11. The Chairman introduced Paper 39/20.

12. Mr Ramon YUEN raised the following views and enquiries: (i) he enquired about the reasons for reducing the DC funds for this financial year. He also noticed that the percentage of reduction for each DC was different, and thus he enquired about the rationale for determining the percentage; (ii) DC had returned \$3.8 million to the Home Affairs Department ("HAD") in the last financial year. He enquired whether it was the reason why the Department reduced funds for this financial year; (iii) as the Council hoped to utilise the remaining funds from the last financial year on anti-epidemic purpose as far as possible, he had enquired about the amount of funds being used at the beginning of this year. However, no definite reply was received; (iv) the actual expenditure on activities organised by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("LCSD") was less than its allocated funds. However, the proposed funds allocated to LCSD were still increased for this financial year. Moreover, the activities held in April this year were all cancelled due to the epidemic. The proposed funds allocated to LCSD should be decreased proportionately. He requested the Department to give an account of it; (v) he enquired about the details of the Vetting Sub-Committee ("VSC") – reserved funds ("reserved funds"); (vi) there were about \$200,000 remaining funds for the employment of contract staff in the last financial year, he hoped that the Secretariat could respond to it.

13. Mr Calvin HO said that DC funds were increased yearly when the Council was dominated by the pro-establishment camp. However, HAD immediately reduced funds

after the pan-democracy camp became dominant, which appeared to be an act of political suppression. He hoped that the Department could provide a detailed explanation.

14. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised the following views and enquiries: (i) he enquired about the priorities of HAD in allocating resources; (ii) the Government had recognised the contribution of DC in the past, and HAD also rarely reduced DC funds. The reduction in funds this time might reflect that the Government had changed its attitude towards DC. He opined that the Government should give an account to the Council and members of the public.

15. Ms Janet NG raised the following views: (i) the Government had disregarded the public's needs for anti-epidemic supplies at the beginning of the epidemic outbreak; (ii) she had enquired of the Secretariat about the amount of DC funds being used in the last financial year, but with no positive response. Therefore, the Council could only utilise the limited funds for anti-epidemic purpose. She opined that the Secretariat did not actively cooperate with DC in handling the anti-epidemic related funding matters; (iii) the Sham Shui Po District Office ("SSPDO") had reservation on the distribution of surgical masks by utilising DC funds. However, some activities funded by the last-term DC had distributed expensive souvenirs before, she hoped that the Office could clarify about it; (iv) activities funded by DC which were scheduled to be held in the first quarter of this year were all cancelled due to the epidemic. It might be one of the reasons why the Secretariat had to return the funds to HAD; (v) if HAD had to cut resources, it should review its expenditure first, instead of asking the Council to cooperate with it.

16. Mr Howard LEE raised the following views: (i) the Government reduced the funds of DC which was dominated by the non-pro-establishment camp by making reference to the practice of Singapore; (ii) DC fought the epidemic with the Government and thus did not agree with the Government's practice of reducing DC funds by using the excuse of fighting against the virus. SSPDO was requested to give an account of the details of fund reduction, its rationale and the whereabouts of the relevant funds.

17. The District Officer gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) Members' concerns over DC funds were noted.
- (ii) HAD would reserve some funds as contingency when allocating funds to various DCs. In the light of the seriousness of the novel coronavirus, the Department had to make corresponding deployment of resources by slightly increasing the amount of contingency funds. The funds allocated to Sham Shui Po District for this financial year were \$25.50 million, reduced by about \$760,000 when compared to the last financial year.

- (iii) SSPDO adopted the same approach as DC in response to the epidemic, and had not disregarded the needs of the general public no matter how much funds were requested. At the beginning of this year, SSPDO had actively cooperated with DC by allocating funds to the Working Group on Healthy and Safe Community (“WGHSC”) for distributing surgical masks. Later, the amount allocated was increased accordingly in response to the epidemic development and the keen demand from the public.

18. The Secretary supplemented as follows:

- (i) In the light of the epidemic development, the Secretariat had urgently allocated about \$600,000 in accordance with DC’s decision at the beginning of this year, and openly invited organisations in the district to organise anti-epidemic activities (including publicity and education as well as distribution of anti-epidemic supplies). In response to the overwhelming public demand, DC had finally allocated about \$1.3 million for the relevant anti-epidemic purposes to benefit more residents in the district.
- (ii) Regarding the funds returned to HAD in the last financial year, as the funds involved had been allocated to district organisations, the Secretariat could only ascertain which activities were cancelled due to the epidemic and the remaining balance thereof towards the end of the financial year. Therefore, it might not be able to allocate the funds to other organisations by open invitation before the end of the financial year.

19. The Chairman enquired about the purpose of HAD’s contingency funds.

20. The District Officer responded as follows:

- (i) The contingency funds were used to deal with emergencies. It was hard to anticipate the epidemic development at this stage. He hoped that Members would understand.
- (ii) SSPDO understood that Members would like to ask for more resources to serve the community. If DC intended to organise more activities to serve the public in the coming year, he promised that the Office would try to accommodate DC’s requests as far as resources permitted.

21. Ms Agnes LEE responded as follows:

- (i) LCSD had to increase the estimated expenditures for this financial year in

anticipation of the salary adjustment for coaches and part-time staff.

- (ii) Some activities to be held in the first quarter of this year had to be cancelled due to the epidemic. The Department had returned the unused funds to SSPDO in accordance with established procedures. If there were remaining funds left in this financial year, the Department would handle the issue according to established procedures.

22. Ms Carman NG opined that SSPDO obstructed the allocation of funds by VSC to district organisations for carrying out anti-epidemic work. She had doubts about the Office's explanation for the contingency funds and requested the Office to hand over the funds to DC.

23. Mr Ramon YUEN raised the following views and enquiries: (i) how to determine the percentage of DC funds reduction, the details of the reserved funds and the expenditure on employment of contract staff; (ii) he understood that the cancellation of some activities could only be confirmed near the end of the financial year, but the Council had rejected some funding applications before. Therefore, he enquired about the details of the funds returned to HAD; (iii) LCSD's response could not fully explain the percentage of increase in estimated expenditure for this financial year. He hoped that the Department could respond again.

24. Ms Janet NG raised the following views and enquiries: (i) HAD only offered assistance in acquiring funds for anti-epidemic work after repeated requests made by the Council; (ii) the Office did not give a timely response to the remaining balance of DC funds for the last financial year. Therefore, she enquired about the details of the funds returned to HAD.

25. Mr Kalvin HO raised the following views: (i) he opined that there was no reason for the Government to reduce the DC funds and requested SSPDO to explain and give an account of the relevant reasons; (ii) as members of the public had a keen demand for surgical masks, the Council hoped to utilise resources to help members of the public fight against the virus; (iii) SSPDO did not obstruct the last-term DC to subsidise the distribution of expensive souvenirs, but it had reservation on the distribution of surgical masks subsidised by the current-term DC. Thus, he requested the Office to respond.

26. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised the following views: (i) the reduction of DC funds indicated that the Government did not attach importance to DC. He could not accept that the functions and the anti-epidemic work of DC were disregarded by the Government; (ii) he opposed the DC funds reduction. If the funds were finally cut, he proposed that the DC funds for the district committees under SSPDO be reduced in order to share the

impact of the funds reduction. He did not want to reduce the funds for the district committees. Therefore, HAD was requested to withdraw its decision on reducing DC funds.

27. Mr Jeffrey SIN suggested that DC determine the usage of the contingency funds.

28. The District Officer responded as follows:

- (i) The percentage of reduction in funds for each DC varied. When determining the percentage of reduction in funds for each district, HAD mainly considered the population, size, economic situation and the usage of funds in the district. Since the situation of each district varied, it was hard to make generalisation.
- (ii) In the last few months, the Office had fully cooperated with DC by processing its applications for organising relevant activities. The funds allocated to WGHSC were finally increased to about \$1.3 million.
- (iii) He clarified that SSPDO did not obstruct VSC to subsidise activities for distributing surgical masks. Since surgical masks were not the usual souvenirs for activities, the Office hoped that surgical masks funded by DC would comply with the anti-epidemic specifications. It was known that some activities involved hiring medical tutors and disseminating anti-epidemic information. The Office was concerned about whether the relevant information was accurate and thus gave a gentle reminder to members at the meeting.

29. The Secretary responded as follows:

- (i) The remaining funds of \$3.8 million returned to HAD were the difference between the funds allocated and the actual expenditure, as some activities did not spend all the funds allocated.
- (ii) According to the Guidelines on the Use of Sham Shui Po District Council Funds for Community Involvement Projects, the programmes applied for the reserved funds were those which met the needs of the community and had been carried out for years; programmes which were innovative and met the current needs of the district, or large-scale programmes. Since each term of office of DC had different requirements for applications of the reserved funds, it was suggested that the decision be made by the Community Affairs Committee (“CAC”) and VSC.

- (iii) The contract staff employed by the use of DC funds included five Executive Assistants and twelve Project Co-ordinators. The relevant funds would also be used to pay for their end-of-contract gratuities.

30. Ms Agnes LEE responded as follows:

- (i) The activities held between January and March were mostly affected by the epidemic, which involved the expenditure in the last financial year.
- (ii) The estimates for this financial year covered the period from April this year to March next year. Since the number of activities had increased, coupled with the salary adjustment of about 5 to 8% each year, the estimates for this financial year would be more than that of the last financial year.

31. The Chairman raised the following views: (i) the actual expenditure of LCSD was about \$1.4 million less than the estimates of the last financial year; (ii) the Council might have to wait until March to know about the remaining funds of the financial year. However, it would be too late to utilise the said funds by then; (iii) the activities held in April this year had been cancelled due to the impact of the epidemic, and the activities in May might not be able to hold as scheduled. He expected that the Department would also have remaining funds for this financial year, and the amount would be more than that of the last financial year. He hoped that the Department could report the details of the expenditure to the Council as soon as possible so that the Council could use the remaining funds for other purposes.

32. Ms Agnes LEE responded as follows:

- (i) LCSD would return the remaining funds to DC as soon as possible.
- (ii) The Department had submitted three applications to DC for funds. The first application would end in July, and it was expected that the remaining funds of the relevant application would be returned to DC in July and August.

33. Ms Janet NG hoped that LCSD could report to the Council the amount of the remaining funds in October so that the Council could use the said funds for other purposes.

34. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu said that LCSD received a relatively large amount of funds, he hoped that the Department could report the estimated remaining balance to the Secretariat as soon as possible so that the Council could use them for other purposes.

35. Ms Eunice CHAU said that she had enquired at the VSC's meeting about whether SSPDO had the right to refuse granting funds to activities for distributing anti-epidemic supplies after the funding applications were approved by VSC and CAC, but the Office did not give a positive response.

36. Mr Leos LEE said that the Office's response at the VSC's meeting had indicated that the Office would examine the details of the anti-epidemic activities, including the promotional pamphlets to be distributed at the activities.

37. Mr WAI Woon-nam raised the following views: (i) SSPDO rarely commented on the promotional items for the activities or activities funded by DC. He did not understand why the Office made additional requests in regards to the anti-epidemic activities organised by the district organisations; (ii) the organiser would take responsibility if the content of the promotional items for the activities was wrong, the Office needed not worry about it.

38. Mr WONG Kit-long raised the following views: (i) at the VSC's meeting, SSPDO said that subsidising activities for distributing surgical masks were not advised. It did not give a positive response as to whether the granting of funds for relevant activities would be rejected, and Members were confused; (ii) regarding the promotional pamphlets for the activities, some Members had suggested that the organiser prepare the pamphlets by making reference to the information provided by the Department of Health. However, the Office did not give a positive response.

39. Mr Ramon YUEN raised the following views: (i) DC was not informed of the amount of the remaining funds sooner, which was not an ideal practice. As the situation of the use of funds would affect the funding amount for the next financial year, SSPDO had to bear certain responsibility for the reduction in funds this time; (ii) the distribution of funds for this financial year was proposed as follows: after making reference to the actual expenditure for the last financial year, the estimates for "employment of contract staff" would be reduced from \$3.7 million to \$3.5 million. The Office could apply for more funds if necessary. It was considered that \$570,000 be reduced from the reserved funds or funds to be allocated to LCSD.

40. Ms Janet NG said that it was very likely that LCSD's activities held between April and June would be cancelled. She suggested adjusting the amount of funds to be allocated to the Department.

41. The Chairman said that LCSD was expected to report in July the amount of funds being saved from the cancellation of activities.

42. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised the following views: (i) it was not necessary to examine the funding details one by one; (ii) reducing the expenditure on contract staff might affect the Council's work. Therefore, he did not support the relevant suggestion; (iii) he opposed the reduction of DC funds, and suggested reducing the funds for the district committees as counter measures. He continued to introduce a provisional motion, and it read as follows: "The Sham Shui Po District Council strongly opposes the District Council ("DC") funds being reduced by the SAR Government, disregarding the role of DC under Hong Kong's constitutional structure, and the need to promote work on COVID-19 prevention and anti-epidemic measures for this year! The Council strongly requests the SAR Government to withdraw the proposal on reducing DC funds, otherwise, the Council will consider to vote down the funding applications submitted by the district committees under the Home Affairs Department!"

43. Ms LAU Pui-yuk raised the following views: (i) DC was an important district consultation structure and would organise district activities such as anti-epidemic activities. It was unreasonable for the Government to reduce DC funds; (ii) the district committees had not yet decided the activities to be organised for this financial year. Considering the fact that the activities were related to residents' well-being, she disagreed that the funds for district committees to be linked with the Government's reduction of DC funds and opposed the provisional motion.

44. Mr Leo HO raised the following views: (i) he disagreed with the reduction of funds as it would affect the anti-epidemic work of DC; (ii) reducing funds for district committees might affect the work for improving people's livelihood. Therefore, he did not support using the allocation of funds to district committees as a bargaining chip, nor the content of the latter half of the provisional motion.

45. Mr Kalvin HO raised the following views: (i) it was intriguing that Members from the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong and the Secretary for Home Affairs from the same political party held opposing standpoints on the reduction of DC funds; (ii) reducing the estimates for the employment of contract staff might affect the services of the Secretariat. He also did not want the Council to become an unscrupulous employer. Therefore, he opposed reducing the relevant estimates; (iii) he supported the provisional motion. Members of district committees were appointed by the Government and most of them were pro-establishment. He believed that they could find other funding sources.

46. Mr Ramon YUEN raised the following views: (i) he supported the provisional motion; (ii) reducing the estimates for the employment of contract staff did not mean that staff members would be dismissed, and the Office could apply for more funds as and when necessary. The \$200,000 saved would be set aside as reserved funds; (iii) HAD

should be held accountable for the reduction of DC funds, and the Secretariat should also inform the Council of the amount of remaining funds as soon as possible.

47. Mr Jay LI raised the following views: (i) he understood Member's rationale to move the provisional motion; (ii) the Government allocated more resources to fight against the epidemic on one hand, and reduced the DC funds on the other hand. If the Government treated DC as its working partner, it should allocate more funds to the Council for implementing anti-epidemic and economic revival activities. He opined that it was unreasonable for the Government to reduce DC funds, and the usage of the funds being saved was unclear; (iii) the Office requested that the masks distributed at the activities should comply with standards. However, it did not make similar requests when food was distributed at the activities, and he was confused.

48. Ms LAU Pui-yuk said that Mr Calvin HO's remarks about her political party was unnecessary. She hoped that he could withdraw the relevant remarks.

49. Mr Calvin HO responded that he did not need to withdraw the remarks as they were true.

50. The Chairman raised the following views and enquiries: (i) SSPDO said that the amount of \$760,000 reduced from the DC funds would be set aside for contingency purpose. However, the Office did not give an account of under which situation would the money be used; (ii) as the situation of the epidemic had gradually improved, the Office might not need to use the said funds, he enquired whether the Office would return the funds to DC or allocate the relevant amount of funds to DC in the next financial year if the epidemic ended.

51. The District Officer responded that:

- (i) The Office would record the request for allocating the relevant amount of funds to DC and consider it as and when necessary.
- (ii) The Office respected Members to move the provisional motion, but the activities organised by the Committees under the Office would be intended to benefit residents. At present, the district committees had not yet decided the activities for this financial year. He hoped that DC could consider the benefits to residents when vetting the relevant funding applications.

52. Ms Janet NG said that the committees mentioned in the provisional motion included those under SSPDO such as Sham Shui Po District Fight Crime Committee.

53. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu added that the committees mentioned in the provisional motion covered all committees led by HAD, including but not limited to area committees. He continued to raise the following views: (i) it was hoped that DC funds would be used to promote district works so as to respond to the community's demands such as fighting the virus, etc. Therefore, he also did not want to reject the relevant funding applications; (ii) he hoped that HAD would withdraw the proposal on reducing DC funds.

54. The Chairman said that the provisional motion was moved by Mr TAM Kwok-kiu and seconded by Ms Janet NG.

55. The meeting voted on the provisional motion by open ballot.

56. The voting result was as follows:

For: Ms Eunice CHAU, Ms Zoé CHOW, Mr CHUM Tak-shing, Mr Calvin HO, Mr KONG Kwai-sang, Mr Andy LAO, Mr Lawrence LAU, Mr Howard LEE, Mr Leos LEE, Mr Joshua LI, Mr Richard LI, Mr Jay LI, Ms Carman NG, Ms Janet NG, Mr Jeffrey SIN, Mr TAM Kwok-kiu, Mr Ronald TSUI, Mr WAI Woon-nam, Mr WONG Kit-long, Mr YEUNG Yuk, Mr Ramon YUEN (21)

Against: Mr Leo HO, Ms LAU Pui-puk (2)

Abstain: (0)

57. The Secretary announced the voting result: 21 Members voted for the motion, 2 Members voted against it and no Member abstained. The Chairman declared that the provisional motion was carried.

58. Mr Ramon YUEN said that the funds saved from his proposed allocation of funds could be set aside as reserved funds or allocated to suitable working group for implementing anti-epidemic work.

59. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised the following views: (i) he supported deducting \$200,000 from the estimates for the employment of contract staff as reserved funds; (ii) considering the need for carrying out anti-epidemic work, he had reservation on reducing the reserved funds.

60. Mr Ramon YUEN said that he would not insist on reducing the reserved funds.

61. Ms Janet NG said that it was fine to set aside the money saved as reserved funds.

62. The Chairman said that the Chairman of Concern Group on the Movement of Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments would like to have more funds. Therefore, he suggested allocating \$100,000 from the money saved to the working group.

63. Members present at the meeting had no objection, and the proposed allocation of funds was endorsed.

64. The Chairman concluded as follows: (i) there was no reason for the Government to reduce DC funds, and it might constitute political suppression; (ii) DC was the Government's partner in fighting the epidemic. The Government was asked not to isolate the Council and should continue to work with DC to fight against the epidemic; (iii) it was hoped that LCSD could cooperate by returning the remaining funds to the Council as soon as possible so that the Council could optimise the use of the remaining funds; (iv) the Council should have the final say on the use of DC funds; (v) DC explicitly opposed the reduction of DC funds. If the Office did not need to use the contingency funds, it should allocate the said funds back to the Council, and SSPDC was asked to take note of it.

65. Mr Ramon YUEN hoped that the Secretariat could report the remaining balance of DC funds at the DC meeting in November this year.

66. Ms Carman NG opined that SSPDO was too cautious when handling funding applications for organising anti-epidemic activities. She requested the Office to exercise the same caution when utilising the contingency funds. The Office should report the use of contingency funds to DC and seek the consent of the Council on the use of funds.

67. The Chairman agreed that SSPDO should report the details of the use of contingency funds.

(c) The air pollution problem in Sham Shui Po District (SSPDO Paper 40/20)

68. Ms Carman NG introduced Paper 40/20 and raised the following views: (i) she regretted that the Environmental Protection Department and the Planning Department did not send representatives to attend the meeting; (ii) she suggested that the Environment and Hygiene Committee ("EHC") continue to follow up on the paper.

69. Ms Carman NG introduced the motion in Paper 40/20 and it read as follows:

"The Committee requests the Government to conduct an extensive public

engagement exercise as the basis for formulating a new Clean Air Plan. This public engagement exercise must be conducted before the new Clean Air Plan is released. The Government should also encourage the active participation of the Sham Shui Po District Council and the seventeen District Councils so that they could serve as platforms for collecting and responding to public views and questions. The Government should try its best to provide the District Council with all information about the air pollution control policy in Sham Shui Po District for facilitating effective discussion in the community.”

70. Ms Janet NG seconded.

71. The meeting voted on the motion.

72. The Chairman announced that the motion was carried unanimously by DC.

73. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu suggested that the paper be discussed at the meeting of EHC, and the departments concerned be invited again to attend the meeting.

74. Ms Carman NG suggested that the paper be discussed at the meetings of EHC and the Working Group on Environmental Protection (“WGEP”).

75. Mr WAI Woon-nam, the Chairman of EHC, and Mr Andy LAO, the Chairman of WGEP, agreed with the said suggestions.

(d) We must ride out the difficulties together and should not discriminate against freelancers (SSPDC Paper 41/20)

(j) Request for the Government to set up a financial assistance system for the unemployed as soon as possible (SSPDC Paper 65/20)

76. The Chairman said that as Papers 41/20 and 65/20 were similar in nature, he suggested discussing the two items together. Members had no objection.

77. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu introduced Paper 41/20.

78. Mr Calvin HO introduced Paper 65/20.

79. The Chairman said that before the meeting, the Secretariat had invited the representatives of the Labour and Welfare Bureau (“LWB”) to attend the meeting, but the Bureau could not send representatives to attend the meeting. Members were asked to refer to the written response of the Bureau (Paper 74/20).

80. Ms Wendy CHAU responded as follows concerning the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (“CSSA”): (i) unemployed persons could apply for CSSA if they had financial difficulties; (ii) the second round of anti-epidemic measures by the Government included a temporary relaxation of the asset limits for able-bodied CSSA applicants by 100% for six months; (iii) the Department would suspend the processing of relevant cases and wait until the effective date of the temporary measure (i.e. 1 June) or later to vet them. For eligible applicants and their family members, the Department would follow procedures to approve their assistance payments.

81. Mr WONG Kit-long raised the following views and enquiries: (i) the Government provided employment subsidies to employers for payment of employees’ salaries, but it was up to employers to decide whether to apply for the subsidies or not. He opined that the Anti-epidemic Fund should provide support to grassroots workers directly; (ii) the first round of the Anti-epidemic Fund failed to provide support to all cleaners and security guards; (iii) he hoped that the Government would provide financial assistance for the unemployed; (iv) the measures by the Government failed to provide support to grassroots workers. He hoped that the Government would seriously review the support targets of the Anti-epidemic Fund.

82. Mr Jeffrey SIN said that even though the asset limits for CSSA applicants were relaxed, a family might still be not eligible to apply for CSSA if one of the family members was employed.

83. Mr KONG Kwai-sang raised the following views: (i) he hoped that the Government would set up a financial assistance system for the unemployed; (ii) the threshold for applying for CSSA on a household basis was too high. Even if the asset limits were relaxed, it was still difficult for people in need to meet the eligibility criteria.

84. Mr Kalvin HO raised the following views: (i) administrative measures impeded the applications for CSSA by people in need; (ii) the application forms for CSSA had to be collected in person at a social security field unit or downloaded from the internet, but the field units were not open every day, which caused inconvenience to the grassroots; (iii) to apply for CSSA, apart from asset and income limits, there were other requirements to meet, such as limits on rent.

85. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised the following views: (i) the Anti-epidemic Fund only targeted at supporting enterprises and employers, which was not of too much help to employees; (ii) he hoped that the Government would draw up measures similar to financial assistance for the unemployed to provide support to the unemployed.

86. Ms Carman NG raised the following views: (i) she was strongly dissatisfied that

LWB could not send representatives to attend the meeting; (ii) freelancers did not benefit from the Anti-epidemic Fund. She hoped that apart from CSSA, the Government would also provide other measures.

87. Mr Lawrence LAU raised the following views: (i) in Response Paper 74/20, LWD stated that “to provide financial assistance for the unemployed, it was necessary to have one of the following three systems first”. He opined that there was no relationship between the provision of financial assistance for the unemployed and the three systems said; (ii) he suggested writing to LWB to enquire about the basis on which the Bureau made the statement above.

88. Mr Jay LI raised the following views: (i) Sham Shui Po was one of the poorest districts in Hong Kong. Many grassroots residents were affected by the epidemic and needed support from the Government; (ii) the measures of the Anti-epidemic Fund “saved the market not the people”, failing to benefit employees; (iii) he hoped the Government would adjust administrative measures so that people in need could apply for support more easily.

89. Mr CHUM Tak-shing raised the following views: (i) relying on CSSA to serve as the main social welfare security system placed a heavy burden on the Government’s coffers; (ii) the CSSA vetting procedures were complicated. Even though the asset limits were relaxed, support might not be immediately available to the unemployed; (iii) he hoped the Government would review afresh the urgency and importance of providing financial assistance for the unemployed.

90. Ms Wendy CHAU gave a consolidated response as follows concerning CSSA:

- (i) Due to the epidemic, opening hours of the field units were reduced. For public convenience, the Department had placed application forms outside the doors of the field units and uploaded them to the website;
- (ii) The Department encouraged the public to mail duly completed forms to the field units or put them in the collection boxes outside the doors of the field units;
- (iii) In view of the rising number of cases, the Department had increased manpower in order to process the applications as soon as possible;
- (iv) If an applicant’s rental was substantially higher than the upper limit of CSSA payments, their staff would first find out whether the applicant’s plans and arrangements were reasonable so as to prevent the situation of the

applicant being unable to cope with enormous rental expenses. In some cases, although the rental exceeded the upper limit of CSSA payments, if the applicants made appropriate arrangements and plans, the Department would still approve their CSSA applications.

91. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu said that the opening hours of the field units were reduced due to the epidemic, causing inconvenience to the people in need in the district.

92. Ms Wendy CHAU responded that all the field units under the Social Welfare Department (“SWD”) would return to normal opening hours starting from next week.

93. The Chairman asked Mr TAM Kwok-kiu to introduce the motion in Paper 41/20.

94. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu said that the motion was moved by him and seconded by Mr Calvin HO, and it read as follows:

“Given the anti-epidemic measures announced on 8 April by the SAR Government preclude freelancers from benefitting from the six-month wage subsidies offered by the Employment Support Scheme, SSPDC strongly condemns this unfair and discriminatory measure; SSPDC strongly requests the SAR Government to immediately amend the Employment Support Scheme, providing six-month wage subsidies for freelancers/self-employed persons as a support measure to ride out the difficulties together.”

95. Mr Jeffrey SIN said that he hoped SWD would not cut the resources for social welfare organisations.

96. Ms LAU Pui-yuk said that she did not agree with the part that condemned the Government in the motion and requested the Government to launch the next round of measures of the Anti-epidemic Fund as soon as possible to support the people that had yet to get any benefit. She also said that she would abstain from voting concerning the motion in Paper 41/20.

97. The meeting voted on the motion in Paper 41/20 by open ballot and the result was as follows:

For:	Ms Eunice CHAU, Mr CHUM Tak-shing, Mr Calvin HO, Mr KONG Kwai-sang, Mr Andy LAO, Mr Lawrence LAU, Mr Howard LEE, Mr Joshua LI, Mr Leos LEE, Mr Richard LI, Mr Jay LI, Mr MAK Wai-ming, Ms Carman NG, Ms Janet NG, Mr Jeffrey SIN, Mr TAM Kwok-kiu, Mr Ronald TSUI,
------	--

Mr WAI Woon-nam, Mr WONG Kit-long, Mr YAN Kai-wing,
Mr YEUNG Yuk, Mr Ramon YUEN (22)

Against: (0)

Abstain: Ms LAU Pui-yuk, Mr Leo HO (2)

98. The Secretary announced the voting result: 22 Members voted for it, no Member voted against it and 2 Members abstained. The Chairman announced that the motion was carried.

99. The Chairman asked Members to vote on the motion in Paper 65/20, which was moved by Mr Calvin HO and seconded by Mr Howard LEE, and it read as follows:

“This Council requests the Government to set up a financial assistance system for the unemployed immediately.”

100. Since no Member present at the meeting voted against it or abstained from voting, the Chairman announced that the motion was carried unanimously.

101. The Chairman concluded as follows: (i) he thanked the representative of SWD for the response; (ii) it was suggested that the matter be referred to CAC for further discussion; (iii) the existing system offered inadequate protection to employees. Employees had nowhere to go for assistance even when they were not given severance payments by their employers or forced to take unpaid leave; (iv) it was hoped that the Government would provide financial assistance for the employed as well as other short-term measures to reduce underemployment and help employees ride out the difficulties; (v) it was hoped that the Bureau and government departments would attend DC meetings in future to give responses to discussion papers.

(e) Request for holding Members accountable for misconduct by displaying a notice of “No ‘blue ribbons’ and dogs allowed” at the joint office of Mr LEE Man-ho, Leos and Mr LAO Ka-hang, Andy to insult residents (SSPDC Paper 43/20)

102. Ms LAU Pui-yuk introduced Paper 43/20.

103. Mr Andy LAO said that the notice concerned had been removed and would like to reprimand the members of the public who had vandalised the ward office and caused injuries.

104. Mr Leos LEE said that he did not understand why individual political parties were

of the view that a petition signed by 130 000 persons could represent the majority's views.

105. Mr CHUM Tak-shing raised the following views: (i) Order 6(5) of the Sham Shui Po District Council Standing Orders ("Standing Orders") empowered the Chairman to approve the agenda of a meeting of DC. He was dissatisfied with the statement that doubted the Chairman's ruling in the paper and requested the Members who submitted the paper to apologise; (ii) as the legal proceedings about the incident had begun, he doubted whether it was appropriate to discuss the agenda item in a DC meeting.

106. Mr Kalvin HO raised the following views: (i) the paper quoted the Code of Conduct for Members of a District Council or Its Committees, stating that a Member's conduct needed to meet the expectations of the general public, but some Members failed to express stances to the Government on behalf of the affected residents concerning the matters of relocation of Pang Tsai and redevelopment of Tai Hang Sai Estate, which could be seen as falling short of the expectations of the general public; (ii) he requested the Members who submitted the paper to withdraw the paper and apologise.

107. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised the following views: (i) the Standing Orders did not grant DC the power of investigation. Therefore, the request of establishing a working group to investigate whether Members' conduct breached the code of conduct was not feasible; (ii) Order 45 of the Standing Orders stipulated that a motion to warn (or reprimand) a Member who breached the code of conduct shall require the signatures of not less than one half of all Members; (iii) relevant government departments had launched an investigation into the incident. DC should wait until the completion of the investigation to have discussions. Therefore, he suggested that the paper should be withdrawn at this stage.

108. Mr Ramon YUEN enquired about the definition of Order 45 of the Standing Orders.

109. The Chairman raised the following views: (i) as the Members who submitted the paper had not explained the urgency to handle the incident in their letter to him, he requested the Members concerned in his reply letter to provide the justifications for convening a special DC meeting. Later on, meetings could not be convened because of the epidemic; (ii) the statement about the violation of the code of conduct by certain Members in the paper might involve subjective judgements. Order 45 of the Standing Orders stipulated that a motion to warn (or reprimand) a Member who breached the code of conduct shall require the signatures of not less than one half of all Members for it to be submitted to a full council meeting for discussion. Therefore, he would handle the motion in the paper according to the Standing Orders.

110. The District Officer gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) Given the word “reprimand” was not used in the motion in the paper, it should not be necessary to handle the motion according to Order 45 of the Standing Orders;
- (ii) He hoped Members could serve the public in an equal manner regardless of political views, especially when the duties of Members involved the use of public money;
- (iii) HAD and SSPDO received a lot of complaints about the incident. HAD opined that the conduct concerned was suspected to have breached the Code of Conduct for Members of a District Council or Its Committees. The Department wrote to the Members concerned in this regard reminding them to observe the code of conduct and also referred the complaints to the Chairman for follow up;
- (iv) He hoped DC could handle the matter in a fair manner and ensure that Members’ words and conduct would not compromise or impair their integrity, impartiality, objectivity or their ability to perform their duties and would not be such as to bring DC into disrepute.

111. The Chairman responded as follows: (i) HAD had requested him before to follow up on the complaints; (ii) Order 45 of the Standing Orders clearly stipulated the procedures for moving a motion to warn (or reprimand) a Member who breached the code of conduct. He reiterated that he would handle the motion according to the Standing Orders.

112. Mr Leo HO refused to apologise or withdraw the paper and said that he had received a lot of complaints about the incident from the public. He opined that Members who refused to serve some members of the public due to different political views went against their duties as public officers, and he requested the Members concerned to apologise for such conduct.

113. Ms LAU Pui-yuk raised the following views: (i) as words such as “reprimand” were not used in the motion in the paper, it was not necessary to handle it according to Order 45 of the Standing Orders; (ii) the incident involved conduct issues of public officers, provoking extensive responses in the society. She criticised the Chairman’s refusal to convene a special meeting to handle the incident as an underestimation of its severity; (iii) Members should not serve members of the public selectively because of political stances. Also, their words and conduct should not provoke conflicts in the

society or bring DC into disrepute.

114. Ms Janet NG raised the following views: (i) the video showed that Ms LAU Pui-yuk led some members of the public to the ground floor of the ward office concerned; (ii) she opined that Members had not refused to serve members of the public because of political views, but some members of the public had vandalised the office, attacked the staff, and even used violence on Members, which severely affected their district work.

115. Mr MAK Wai-ming raised the following views: (i) Members should provide services to the members of the public in need; (ii) he hoped that Members would be concerned about other issues related to people's livelihoods, such as provision of support for the students taking the Diploma of Secondary Education exams this year, who had been under much pressure.

116. Mr Leos LEE said that when serving the public, he would not check their political stances. He opined that DC should not continue to discuss the paper and requested that the motion be put to a vote as quickly as possible.

117. Ms LAU Pui-yuk raised the following views: (i) she opined that the incident had provoked responses in the society, making it worthy of discussion in DC; (ii) she opined that Members should serve members of the public regardless of political views; (iii) she clarified that she did not know the members of the public who had petitioned at the ward office and requested Ms Janet NG to provide evidence for the remarks she just made.

118. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu opined that DC should not continue to discuss or handle the paper and suggested that the Chairman seek DC's views to decide whether to handle the motion.

119. Mr CHUM Tak-shing said that DC was just an advisory body and enquired whether DC, its committees or its working groups could exercise the power of investigation.

120. Mr Lawrence LAU opined that DC did not have the power of investigation and therefore the content of the motion might fall outside the scope of power.

121. The Chairman raised the following views: (i) Members could cast opposing votes to express their stances; (ii) according to Order 24 of the Standing Orders, "a motion to adjourn debate on a motion or discussion of an item by the Council may be moved by the Chairman or a member who has neither moved, seconded or spoken on any motion bearing on that item...". If a request was made by a Member satisfying the above

conditions, he would handle it.

122. Mr KONG Kwai-sang moved a motion to adjourn the discussion of the agenda item.

123. The Chairman said that as Mr KONG Kwai-sang had neither moved, seconded or spoken on any motion bearing on that item, he would handle his motion according to Order 24 of the Standing Orders.

124. The District Officer said that the agenda item had been discussed for more than one hour and if only until that time did DC decide to adjourn the discussion of the paper, DC should perhaps provide appropriate justifications. He further suggested that Members who had views on the content of the motion propose amendments to the motion instead of adjourning the handling of the paper.

125. The Chairman said that unless the Member concerned withdrew the request for adjourning the discussion of the agenda item, he would handle it according to Order 24 of the Standing Orders.

126. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised the following views: (i) Members had the right to submit papers for discussion. However, DC should reach a consensus on whether to handle the motion in the paper; (ii) although the paper had been thoroughly discussed, the content of the motion might fall outside the terms of reference of DC. Therefore, it would be more appropriate to adjourn the handling of the motion.

127. The Chairman reminded Members to focus the discussion on whether to handle the motion in the paper.

128. Mr Ramon YUEN said that as the Members had removed the notice in question, the content of the motion was no longer applicable. Therefore, he opined that it was not necessary to put the motion to a vote and it would be more appropriate to adjourn the discussion.

129. Ms LAU Pui-yuk suggested amending the word “investigate” in the motion to “follow up” and said that the content of the motion would not fall outside the terms of reference of DC after the amendment. She believed that the public hope to understand Members’ stances through the voting result and therefore she requested a vote on the motion.

130. Mr Leos LEE said that he had an open attitude to whether to adjourn the discussion, but given the notice in question had been removed, the part of the motion that

requested immediate withdrawal of the notice was not applicable anymore.

131. The Chairman asked Members to vote on the motion moved by Mr KONG Kwai-sang in accordance with Order 24 of the Standing Orders and seconded by Mr WAI Woon-nam, and it read as follows:

“Request an adjournment of discussion of the motion in Paper 43/20 by DC.”

132. The meeting voted on the motion by open ballot and the result was as follows:

For: Mr YEUNG Yuk, Ms Janet NG, Ms Eunice CHAU, Ms Zoé CHOW, Mr CHUM Tak-shing, Mr Calvin HO, Mr KONG Kwai-sang, Mr Lawrence LAU, Mr Howard LEE, Mr Joshua LI, Mr Richard LI, Mr Jay LI, Mr MAK Wai-ming, Ms Carman NG, Mr Jeffrey SIN, Mr TAM Kwok-kiu, Mr Ronald TSUI, Mr WAI Woon-nam, Mr WONG Kit-long, Mr Ramon YUEN, Mr YAN Kai-wing (21)

Against: Mr Leo HO, Ms LAU Pui-yuk (2)

Abstain: Mr Andy LAO, Mr Leos LEE (2)

133. The Secretary announced the voting result: 21 Members voted for it, 2 Members voted against it and 2 Members abstained. The Chairman announced that the motion was carried and the discussion of the motion in Paper 43/20 was adjourned.

(f) Strongly condemn the brutal attacks on elected Members (SSPDC Paper 44/20)

134. The Chairman said that as the cases mentioned in Paper 44/20 were being investigated by the Police, their discussion should avoid involving the content of the cases so as to avoid incurring legal liabilities.

135. Ms Eunice CHAU introduced Paper 44/20 and reprimanded the representatives of SSPDO and the Police for not accepting the petition letter.

[Some Members left their seats and stood behind Ms Eunice CHAU.]

136. The Chairman asked Members to return to their seats.

137. The District Officer said that attendees of the meeting, including government department representatives, reporters and Members, should observe order, including taking their seats according to the seating plan. He requested the Chairman to maintain

order so as to ensure that the meeting could go on smoothly.

138. Ms Eunice CHAU said that some Members stood behind her in protest as the Police and SSPDO did not send representatives to accept the petition letter.

139. Mr Tony HO responded as follows:

- (i) As the cases mentioned in the paper were being investigated by the Police, it was not appropriate to disclose or discuss the content of the cases in public occasions so as to avoid affecting the investigations.
- (ii) Attendees of the meeting were welcome to provide the Police with any information that could help follow up on the cases.
- (iii) Everyone was equal before the law and no one was above the law. If there was evidence showing a person had broken the law, the Police would deal with it in a fair, just and impartial manner.

140. Ms Janet NG said that since January this year, many Members had received anonymous phone calls and letters of an intimidating nature, and their banners and ward offices had also been frequently vandalised, threatening their personal safety. She requested the Police to deal with these situations according to the law.

141. Mr Joshua LI raised the following views: (i) he opined that the refusal of SSPDO and the Police to send representatives to accept the petition letter was a disregard for Members' requests; (ii) when carrying out district work on the night of 14 February this year, he was stopped and searched by the Police and during the course of which he was subject to foul language by the Police. He opined that the police officers concerned were "black cops" and failed to perform duties properly.

142. The Chairman reminded Members to be mindful of their choice of words when speaking and said that if the above incident was true, he reprimanded the Police for using foul language when enforcing the law.

143. Mr Leos LEE queried whether it was justifiable for the Police to refuse to accept the petition letter on the grounds that it was not appropriate to discuss the content of the case in public occasions. He reiterated that accepting the petition letter would not affect the investigation.

144. Mr Tony HO gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) If anyone was in possession of any information about violent attacks on Members, they were welcome to contact the Police directly.
- (ii) He requested the Chairman to rule whether it was appropriate for the Member to use “black cops” to describe the Police in Hong Kong.

145. The Chairman asked Mr Joshua LI if he would withdraw the remarks concerned.

146. Mr Joshua LI responded that the police officers concerned had used foul language when performing duties, which breached the guidelines of the Police and brought shame to the Police. Therefore, he would not withdraw the remarks concerned.

147. The Chairman said that he would not request the Member concerned to withdraw his remarks.

148. Mr Tony HO said that the Chairman’s ruling reflected that DC agreed with the remarks concerned and as fair treatment and respect were not received in the meeting, the Police representatives would walk out in protest.

149. The Chairman regretted that the Police representatives left midway through the meeting. He then asked Members to vote on the first motion, which was moved by Ms Eunice CHAU and seconded by Mr Leos LEE, and it read as follows:

“This Council strongly reprimands violent elements for attacking elected Members.”

150. The meeting voted on the motion by open ballot and the result was as follows:

For: Mr YEUNG Yuk, Ms Janet NG, Ms Eunice CHAU, Ms Zoé CHOW, Mr CHUM Tak-shing, Mr Calvin HO, Mr KONG Kwai-sang, Mr Andy LAO, Mr Lawrence LAU, Mr Howard LEE, Mr Leos LEE, Mr Joshua LI, Mr Richard LI, Mr Jay LI, Mr MAK Wai-ming, Ms Carman NG, Mr Jeffrey SIN, Mr TAM Kwok-kiu, Mr Ronald TSUI, Mr WAI Woon-nam, Mr WONG Kit-long, Mr Ramon YUEN, Mr YAN Kai-wing (23)

Against: Mr Leo HO, Ms LAU Pui-yuk (2)

Abstain: (0)

151. The Secretary announced the voting result: 23 Members voted for it, 2 Members

voted against it and no Member abstained. The Chairman announced that the motion was carried.

152. The Chairman asked Members to vote on the second motion, which was moved by Ms Eunice CHAU and seconded by Mr Leos LEE, and it read as follows:

“This Council requests the Hong Kong Police Force to provide this Council with the investigation progress on the two attack cases.”

153. Since no Member voted against it or abstained from voting, the Chairman announced that the motion was carried unanimously.

(g) A police officer stepped on the genitals of a street sleeper Follow up on street sleepers being abused on 24/2 and request the Police to discipline those police officers who were involved in the incident (SSPDC Paper 45/20)

154. Mr Ronald TSUI introduced Paper 45/20 and regretted that the Police representatives left early and thus could not respond to Members' enquiries on the agenda item.

155. The Chairman said that as the incident mentioned in Paper 45/20 was being investigated by the Police, their discussion should refrain from discussing the content of the incident so as to avoid legal liabilities.

156. Ms Agnes LEE introduced Response Paper 72/20.

157. Ms Wendy CHAU introduced Response Paper 76/20 and added that as the legal proceedings about the incident had begun, to avoid disclosure of personal details of a third person, SWD could not unveil the content concerned.

158. Mr Ronald TSUI raised the following enquiries: (i) whether the above incident was treated as a criminal case; (ii) whether SWD provided assistance to the homeless people who were subject to unfriendly treatment.

159. Mr WAI Woon-nam regretted that the Police representatives left the meeting early and enquired about the implementation progress on the homeless-friendly initiatives approved by the last-term DC.

160. Mr Calvin HO raised the following views: (i) the incident reflected that the society did not provide sufficient support to homeless people. Relevant government departments should open up the changing rooms and lockers in their venues for homeless

people; (ii) he requested the Police to give the public an account of the use of violence by the police officers concerned during their performance of duties; (iii) SSPDC and relevant government departments should implement homeless-friendly initiatives proactively.

161. Mr Jay LI raised the following views: (i) the Government did not step up its support for the underprivileged groups affected by the epidemic, leading to a rise in the number of homeless people; (ii) he was worried that if violent incidents happened again, personal safety of homeless people would be jeopardised.

162. Ms Agnes LEE gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) As requested by the Police, LCSD had provided a copy of the CCTV footage taken in Tung Chau Street Park on the day of the incident to the Police for investigation. The investigation progress on the concerned incident should be subject to police announcement.
- (ii) The Department had arranged maintenance and repair works for the damaged facilities in its venues.
- (iii) According to the departmental guidelines, if an object was left in a locker after a venue was closed, staff of the Department would notify the owner or take the object out of the locker. Therefore, it was not suitable to lend lockers to street sleepers.

163. Ms Wendy CHAU gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) The investigation progress on the incident should be subject to police announcement. To protect privacy, SWD should not disclose personal information of a third person in the incident to the public.
- (ii) Violent incidents happened in the society needed to be followed up by relevant law enforcement departments. The Department would provide support to people with welfare needs.
- (iii) The Department would provide street sleepers with assistance including housing and financial assistance if they needed it and were willing to receive services.

164. The Chairman enquired whether SWD had provided assistance to the homeless person in the incident on its own initiative.

165. Ms Wendy CHAU responded that the Integrated Services Teams for Street Sleepers and social workers of the Department had continued to visit the street sleepers in Tung Chau Street Park regularly in the past few months and provided assistance according to their needs.

166. The District Officer responded that SSPDO had an open attitude to the establishment of hostels for street sleepers, but some members of the public had expressed worries before over the environmental hygiene and drug problems the above plan would bring about. Therefore, he suggested that DC adopt a bottom-up approach, finding a consensus on the hostel site and operating organisation first and then carry out public consultations and other work.

167. The Chairman said that he received a provisional motion which was moved by Mr Ronald TSUI and seconded by Mr Kalvin HO.

168. Mr Ronald TSUI introduced the provisional motion, which read as follows:

“Given the Police left the meeting, Paper 45/20 could not be discussed thoroughly in the absence of the Police and this Council expresses regret. This Council now moves a motion to request the Hong Kong Police Force to make public the investigation progress on the abuse of a homeless person in Tung Chau Street on 24 February 2020, including the disciplinary actions on the police officers involved and the prosecution progress, and to give a written response to this Council within one week.”

169. Mr Lawrence LAU said that requesting the Police to provide the progress on the disciplinary actions on the police officers involved might affect the investigation and suggested removing the said part.

170. Mr Ronald TSUI agreed with the above suggestion. He deleted the words “including the disciplinary actions on the police officers involved and the prosecution progress” from the provisional motion and amended “警務署” to “警務處”.

171. Since no Member voted against it or abstained from voting, the Chairman announced that the provisional motion was carried unanimously. He then concluded that DC hoped that through stepping up the collaboration with relevant government departments, the issues concerning homeless people would continue to be followed up by relevant working groups under DC.

(h) Request for the Government to focus on fighting the Wuhan Pneumonia and not to use anti-epidemic as an excuse for suppression (SSPDC Paper 47/20)

(i) Concern over the Police and the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department adopting inconsistent standards on law enforcement against restaurants in the District in respect of the prohibition on group gathering (SSPDC Paper 48/20)

172. The Chairman said that as Papers 47/20 and 48/20 were similar in nature, he suggested discussing the two papers together. Members had no objection.

173. Mr Joshua LI introduced Paper 47/20 and raised the following views and enquiries: (i) he regretted that the Police representatives were not present at the meeting to give a response; (ii) he enquired about the definitions of the number of restaurant customers and the number of seats under the prohibition on group gathering, as well as the specific standards in the enforcement of the prohibition on group gathering in different public occasions.

174. Mr WONG Kit-long introduced Paper 48/20 and raised the following enquiries: (i) whether a restaurant's eligibility for the anti-epidemic subsidy for the catering sector would be affected if it was prosecuted for violation of the prohibition on group gathering; (ii) what the definition of "gather for a common purpose" was under the prohibition on group gathering.

175. Mr SUM Siu-hin introduced Response Paper 69/20 and added the following:

- (i) From 28 March to 27 April 2020, the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department ("FEHD") inspected all 976 relevant catering outlets in the district and gave 161 verbal warnings. Regarding cases where the warnings were not heeded, the Department prosecuted the restaurants concerned during re-inspections.
- (ii) The Department had yet to launch joint operations with the Police in the district in respect of the prohibition on group gathering.
- (iii) The restaurants were prosecuted by the Department mainly for failing to ensure tables were at least 1.5 meters apart or effectively partitioned, or failing to provide thermometers and sanitising products.

176. Mr Joshua LI enquired how the total number of seats in a restaurant was defined under the prohibition on group gathering.

177. Mr SUM Siu-hin responded as follows:

- (i) Relevant laws did not specify how the total number of seats in a restaurant

was calculated. Restaurants were in compliance with the prohibition on group gathering as long as they provided no more than half of the seats usually provided.

- (ii) No restaurants in the district had been prosecuted by FEHD for violation of the requirement on the number of seats.

178. Mr Joshua LI raised the following views and enquiries: (i) he opined that inconsistent yardsticks had been deployed by the Police in the past law enforcement actions on the prohibition on group gathering; (ii) he enquired whether FEHD had kept information on the total numbers of seats of restaurants and whether law enforcement officers would use such information to determine if a restaurant was in compliance with the prohibition on group gathering.

179. Mr WONG Kit-long asked FEHD whether restaurants prosecuted for violation of the prohibition on group gathering would be rejected if they applied for the anti-epidemic subsidy for the catering sector.

180. Ms Janet NG said that she hoped FEHD would make public the figures on the prosecutions related to violation of the prohibition on group gathering, the names of the restaurants prosecuted and the grounds for prosecution.

181. The Chairman enquired about the division of work between FEHD and the Police concerning the law enforcement work on the prohibition on group gathering.

182. Mr SUM Siu-hin gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) If layouts and numbers of seats were provided in the plans submitted by restaurants for issuance of licenses, the data on the plans would be used as reference. If no seating information was provided in the plans, the Department would use the usual numbers of seats in restaurants as reference.
- (ii) The application window for phase 1 of the anti-epidemic subsidy for the catering sector would close on 4 May 2020, while the eligibility criteria and forms for phase 2 were not yet available.
- (iii) Phase 2 of the anti-epidemic subsidy for the catering sector was mainly for providing support to the licensed catering outlets affected by social distancing measures, and the subsidy must be used to pay employees' salaries. If restaurants were still not in compliance with the requirements

after being warned or prosecuted by FEHD, the vetting of the subsidy applications concerned might be affected.

- (iv) Generally speaking, FEHD would conduct inspections and take law enforcement actions at all restaurants, while the Police would mainly take law enforcements actions at liquor-licensed premises.

183. Mr Joshua LI introduced the motion in Paper 47/20, which read as follows:

“Complete closure of borders immediately by the SAR Government to protect the Mainland China where the epidemic conditions are stable and the number of confirmed cases has not increased for weeks and protect the safety of Chinese compatriots.”

184. Mr Lawrence LAU said that DC had no rights to interfere with the internal affairs of the Mainland and therefore suggested deleting the words “and protect the safety of Chinese compatriots” in the motion.

185. Mr Joshua LI agreed with Mr Lawrence LAU’s suggestion.

186. Mr Lawrence LAU suggested amending the motion to “complete closure of borders immediately by the SAR Government to keep epidemic under control.”

187. Mr WONG Kit-long seconded it.

188. The meeting voted on the amended motion.

189. The Chairman announced that the amended motion was carried unanimously.

190. Mr WONG Kit-long introduced the motion in Paper 48/20, which read as follows:

“Strongly reprimand the Police and FEHD for adopting inconsistent standards in the enforcement of the prohibition on group gathering and taking selective law enforcement actions which target the ‘yellow shops’ in the district.”

191. Mr Jeffrey SIN seconded it.

192. The meeting voted on the motion.

193. The Chairman announced that the motion was carried unanimously.

(k) Request for improving the operation of the Jockey Club Creative Arts Centre (SSPDC Paper 42/20)

194. Mr Jay LI introduced Paper 42/20.

195. Mr Howard LEE added that the poor management of Jockey Club Creative Arts Centre (“JCCAC”) affected the local development of arts and culture. He hoped that JCCAC would strengthen the communication with tenants and review the current operation, as well as giving regular reports to SSPDC.

196. The Chairman said that before the meeting, the Secretariat had invited the Home Affairs Bureau (“HAB”) and JCCAC to the meeting but the parties concerned could not send representatives to attend. Members were asked to refer to the written response of HAB (Paper 78/20).

197. Mr WONG Kit-long said that the Government lacked effective cultural policies to support organisations to promote and develop arts and culture, which indirectly resulted in the bad management of JCCAC. He opined that the Government should review and improve cultural policies and encourage the development of arts and culture.

198. Mr Kalvin HO raised the following views: (i) artists’ livelihoods were affected by the epidemic. The Anti-epidemic Fund only disbursed a subsidy of \$7,500 to each artist, showing that the Government did not attach importance to the development of arts and culture and its support for the arts and cultural sector was insufficient; (ii) he suggested that the Government intervene in a timely manner and encourage the managing staff of JCCAC to communicate with tenants.

199. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised the following views: (i) he regretted that the Bureau could not send representatives to the meeting; (ii) both PMQ and JCCAC were promoting creative industries but the financial assistance they received during the epidemic was not the same. He hoped that relevant departments would give a response; (iii) JCCAC put only a small amount of resources into promotion of arts and cultural activities. He hoped JCCAC would take the lead to promote the local development of arts and culture. He suggested that DC pay close attention to the positioning and development of JCCAC in future and invite relevant stakeholders to meetings of the Working Group on Sports, Arts and Culture.

200. Ms Janet NG said that she hoped the Bureau would intervene and fully waive the rental of JCCAC’s tenants during the epidemic.

201. Mr Jay LI raised the following views: (i) he was disappointed that the Bureau

could not send representatives to the meeting; (ii) the resource mismatch problem was serious. He opined that efforts should be made to address and improve the current financial allocation, as well as putting more resources into promotion of arts and cultural activities; (iii) the amount of financial assistance obtained by PMQ from the Anti-epidemic Fund was more than other arts organisations. He hoped relevant departments would give a response to this.

202. Ms Carman NG raised the following views: (i) she was disappointed that the Bureau and JCCAC could not send representatives to the meeting and hoped that relevant departments would give written responses to members' enquiries; (ii) she suggested passing the matter to relevant committees and working groups for follow up.

203. Mr Jeffrey SIN said that the tenants earned no income during the epidemic but were still required to pay rental, which was not a sympathetic treatment.

204. The Chairman concluded as follows: (i) DC regretted that HAB and JCCAC could not send representatives to the meeting and hoped relevant departments and organisations would give responses to Members' enquiries after the meeting; (ii) the matter would be passed to CAC for follow up. It was hoped that relevant departments and organisations would send representatives to CAC meetings to give a briefing on the development direction, planning and arts and cultural policies of JCCAC, as well as facilitating exchange of views.

205. The District Officer said that he understood that Members present at the meeting were concerned about the operation of JCCAC, but it might not be appropriate for DC to intervene too much in matters related to the daily operation of JCCAC. Nevertheless, SSPDO would continue to coordinate the communication with JCCAC and facilitate the exchange of views.

(I) Request for resuming the land of the Police Sports & Recreation Club for rezoning (SSPDC Paper 46/20)

206. Mr Jay LI introduced Paper 46/20.

207. The Chairman said that the Police representatives had left the meeting and thus could not respond to the paper, and before the meeting, the Secretariat had invited PlanD to the meeting but the Department could not send representatives to attend. Members were asked to refer to the written response of PlanD (Paper 71/20). He suggested passing the paper to the Planning Development and Transport Affairs Committee ("PTAC") for follow up.

208. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised the following views: (i) some members of the public

said that police vehicles had accessed the site of the Police Sports & Recreation Club (“PSRC”) in the past few months; (ii) according to the response of PlanD, the Lands Department (“LandsD”) had the responsibility to check whether the use of the site conformed to its planned use; (iii) he enquired whether the site was used as an operation centre of the Police.

209. Mr Jeffrey SIN agreed with the suggestions made in the paper and enquired whether the swimming pool in PSRC was managed by LCSD.

210. The Chairman said that the swimming pool was not managed by LCSD and requested the Department to give a response.

211. Ms Agnes LEE responded as follows: (i) there were five sports centres, three swimming pools and one rugby ground in Sham Shui Po District, and sports centres would be built at both Site 6 and Po Lun Street; (ii) the said leisure and cultural facilities in Sham Shui Po District conformed with the planning standards.

212. Mr Kalvin HO added the following concerning the paper: (i) the suggestion of converting PSRC to a service centre for ethnic minorities was made because the site was on the border between Sham Shui Po District and Yau Tsim Mong District, and Yau Tsim Mong District was where most of the ethnic minorities in Hong Kong lived; (ii) Muslims had a keen demand for venues for religious ceremonies and education. It was known that a Muslim religious leader had solicited help from SSPDO before to find venues for religious activities; (iii) he hoped that SSPDO would follow up on the request.

213. Mr Lawrence LAU suggested writing to the Police to enquire if they had used PSRC for their operations or supporting purposes.

214. Mr Jay LI raised the following views: (i) he agreed that this matter should continue to be followed up by committees; (ii) apart from PlanD, other relevant departments should also give responses; (iii) PlanD indicated in its response that according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, there was no shortfall in the supply of leisure and cultural facilities in Sham Shui Po District. However, the area concerned included Shek Kip Mei and its vicinity so the actual situations of old areas in Sham Shui Po were not reflected.

215. The Chairman agreed to write to the Police to enquire if they had used PSRC for their operations or supporting purposes.

216. The District Officer responded as follows: (i) he suggested discussing the welfare needs of ethnic minorities and the use of the PSRC site separately; (ii) after being

informed by Members and organisations that they wished venues would be available for religious activities, HAD and SSPDO had followed up on the matters concerned; (iii) SSPDO and LandsD were exploring whether a suitable site was available. However, as the area required was quite large (over 10 000 square feet), it would take time to handle the matter; (iv) if a suitable site was available, he hoped Members would give their support during local consultations.

217. The Chairman concluded as follows: (i) the suggestion of converting PSRC to a service centre for ethnic minorities might not be able to satisfy the existing demands in time. It was hoped that relevant government departments would help address the problem of inadequate number of venues for religious activities; (ii) as it was for PlanD to decide whether to take back the PSRC site or not, it was suggested that the discussion paper be passed to PTAC for follow up.

Item 3: Reports from Committees and Working Groups under the District Council

(a) Reports from Committees

- (i) Report from the District Facilities Committee (SSPDC Paper 49/20)
- (ii) Reports from the Community Affairs Committee (SSPDC Papers 50/20 and 51/20)
- (iii) Report from the Environment and Hygiene Committee (SSPDC Paper 52/20)
- (iv) Report from the Planning Development and Transport Affairs Committee (SSPDC Paper 53/20)
- (v) Report from the Housing Affairs Committee (SSPDC Paper 54/20)

218. Ms Janet NG raised her views on Paper 53/20, opining that illegal car racing problems on Kwai Chung Road Flyover were getting serious and requesting the Police to step up the efforts against the problems.

219. The Chairman said that the Police had been requested in a PTAC meeting to step up the enforcement efforts. He suggested including the matter in the list of follow-up matters of PTAC meetings and requesting the Police to give a report in the next PTAC meeting.

220. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised his views on Paper 54/20, urging the Housing Department (“HD”) to take the initiative to inspect the vent pipes in public housing

estates and water pipes in old-styled housing estates.

221. Ms LING Kuk-yi responded that HD attached importance to the maintenance and repair of vent pipes in public housing estates, and the design of vent pipes conformed with the prevailing standards at the time the housing estates were completed. The Department had no plan to extend the vent pipes to two metres for the time being.

222. The meeting noted and endorsed the content of the aforesaid reports.

(b) Reports from Working Groups directly under the District Council

- (i) Report from Working Groups directly under the District Council (SSPDC Paper 55/20)
- (ii) Report from the Working Group on Healthy and Safe Community (SSPDC Papers 56/20, 57/20 and 66/20)
- (iii) Report from the Working Group on Pang Tsai and Fashion Base (SSPDC Paper 58/20)

223. The meeting noted and endorsed the content of the aforesaid reports.

Item 4: Any other business

(a) Relevant arrangements for the Home Affairs Department's fund reserve for specific purposes under the district minor works programme (SSPDC Paper 59/20)

224. The Chairman asked Members to refer to Paper 59/20.

225. Mr WAI Woon-nam enquired whether consultants' performances would be appraised by DC.

226. The District Officer responded that HAD engaged consultants for all 18 districts and had a set of established criteria for appraising their performances, while all district councils could also convey their views to HAD.

227. The Chairman concluded that DC noted the arrangements concerned.

(b) Market Management Consultative Committee of public markets under the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (SSPDC Paper 60/20)

228. The Chairman said that FEHD invited SSPDC to recommend Members to join the Market Management Consultative Committees (“MMCCs”) of four public markets in the district and the tenure would be the same as that of DC. He asked Members to make nominations.

229. Mr SUM Siu-hin added that: (i) to increase foot traffic in markets and enhance day-to-day management, each public market had its own MMCC, which was chaired by a Chief Health Inspector of FEHD and composed of Members, contractors of the Architectural Services Department and the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department, representatives of market traders, etc.; (ii) MMCCs would be joined by Members of the constituencies concerned and district councils would also be invited to recommend one or two Members to join the MMCC based on the numbers of stalls in the market concerned.

230. Mr CHUM Tak-shing nominated Mr KONG Kwai-sang and Mr Howard LEE to join the MMCC of Po On Road Market.

231. Ms Janet NG and Mr Andy LAO recommended themselves to join the MMCC of Pei Ho Street Market.

232. Mr Calvin HO nominated Mr WAI Woon-nam to join the MMCC of Pei Ho Street Market.

233. Mr Howard LEE nominated Mr Jay LI and Mr WONG Kit-long to join the MMCC of Tung Chau Street Temporary Market.

234. Ms Eunice CHAU recommended herself to join the MMCC of Lai Wan Market.

235. The Chairman said that the meeting endorsed all of the nominations and self-recommendations above.

(c) Invitation for nominating a District Council Member to be a co-opted member for the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing under the Harbourfront Commission (SSPDC Paper 61/20)

236. The Chairman said that the Harbourfront Commission invited SSPDC to nominate a Member to be a co-opted member for the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing under the commission and the tenure would end on 30 June 2021. He asked Members to make nominations.

237. Mr CHUM Tak-shing nominated Ms Zoé CHOW.

238. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu nominated Mr Jay LI.

239. Mr Ramon YUEN opined that it would be more appropriate to have the Member of the constituency concerned (i.e. Ms Zoé CHOW) as the co-opted member.

240. Mr Jay LI said that from the perspective of district development, giving priority to the Member of the constituency concerned to be the co-opted member was reasonable.

241. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu agreed that SSPDC could let Ms Zoé CHOW to be the co-opted member first but opined that it was not necessary for the position to be taken by the Member of the constituency concerned.

242. The Chairman said that the meeting endorsed the nomination of Ms Zoé CHOW to be the co-opted member of the task force.

(d) Invitation from the Mandatory Building Inspection Scheme and the Mandatory Window Inspection Scheme for nominating a District Council Member for the Panel for the Selection of Target Buildings (SSPDC Paper 62/20)

243. The Chairman said that the Independent Checking Unit under the Transport and Housing Bureau (“THB”) invited SSPDC to nominate a Member to join the Panel for the Selection of Target Buildings. He asked Members to make nominations.

244. Mr CHUM Tak-shing said that the last-term DC had appointed him to join the panel for the Mandatory Building Inspection Scheme and the Mandatory Window Inspection Scheme and the tenure would end in July 2022. He enquired whether the invitation was for the same panel.

245. The Secretary clarified that the panel of the Buildings Department (“BD”) and the Independent Checking Unit mentioned in the paper were two different bodies.

246. Mr Joshua LI said that as shown in the website of BD, Mr CHUM Tak-shing was a member of the Selection Panel (Mandatory Building Inspection Scheme and Mandatory Window Inspection Scheme) and the tenure would end on 14 July 2022. He suspected the department concerned had made a mistake.

247. The Chairman suggested that the Secretariat contact the bureau/department concerned to understand the situation first and ask Members to make nominations by circulation of papers later.

[Post-meeting note: The above invitation was made by the Panel for the Selection of Target Buildings of the Independent Checking Unit under THB, which was different from the Selection Panel of BD. DC later endorsed the nomination of Mr KONG Kwai-sang to join the panel mentioned in Paper 62/20 by circulation of papers on 13 May 2020.]

(e) Nominate a District Council Member to be “sports ambassador” (SSPDC Paper 63/20)

248. The Chairman said that LCSD invited SSPDC to nominate no less than two Members to be the “sports ambassadors” for Sham Shui Po District and the tenure would end at the end of 2021. He asked Members to make nominations.

249. Ms Agnes LEE added that the Department hoped to encourage the public to exercise regularly and develop a healthy lifestyle through Members and would invite the “sports ambassadors” to attend large-scale activities to help with the publicity.

250. Mr Howard LEE nominated Mr Leos LEE.

251. Mr Leos LEE nominated Mr Andy LAO.

252. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu nominated Mr Howard LEE.

253. Mr Ronald TSUI recommended himself.

254. The Chairman said that the meeting endorsed all of the nominations and self-recommendation above.

(f) Nominate a candidate to be member of the Organising Committee of the 8th Hong Kong Games, authorise the Organising Committee to display the logo of the District Council and build hyperlink to the website (SSPDC Paper 64/20)

255. The Chairman said that the Organising Committee of the 8th Hong Kong Games invited SSPDC to nominate a Member to be a member of the organising committee and sought authorisation from SSPDC to display the logo of DC. He then asked members to make nominations.

256. Mr Ramon YUEN said that many people had commented that the Hong Kong Games of recent years had been unattractive and the public response had been unenthusiastic. He suggested that DC consider whether to continue to participate in it.

257. Ms Agnes LEE responded that: (i) the Department always hoped to encourage

residents in the district to represent the district to participate in the games; (ii) she hoped Members would support the Hong Kong Games and the Members joining the organising committee could represent the district to raise views.

258. Ms Carman NG said that the events in the past Hong Kong Games had generally remained the same. She suggested carrying out reforms, for example, increasing events and improving the methods used to group athletes by age.

259. Mr CHUM Tak-shing nominated Ms Carman NG to join the organising committee.

260. The Chairman announced that the meeting endorsed the nomination above and authorised the organising committee to display the logo of DC and build hyperlinks to the website.

Item 3: Date of next meeting

261. The next meeting would be held at 9:30 a.m. on 23 June 2020 (Tuesday).

262. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:53 p.m.

District Council Secretariat
Sham Shui Po District Office
June 2020